

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner's thorough examination and allowance of claims 1-6, 11, and 16 is appreciated. While Applicants do not agree with the present rejection of claims 7-9, 12, and 17 in view of Gamm and Honn, Applicants have canceled those claims to advance prosecution to a Notice of Allowance and issuance of a patent, and reserve the right to pursue the canceled claims in a continuation application. Entry of the canceled claims is respectfully requested since the cancellation of the identified claims reduces the issues on appeal. Applicants reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents and believe that the pending claims are entitled to a full range of equivalents despite cancellation of claims 7-9, 12, and 17.

The remaining objections and rejections are discussed below.

The Objection to the Specification

Claims 10 and 13 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c) as being in improper form for being multiple dependent claims depending from other multiple dependent claims. While it is believed that this objection was previously treated, claims 10 and 13 have been canceled and the objection is deemed moot.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 14-15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to describe in the specification "A computer readable storage medium encoded with computer executable instructions...to the perform the following steps..." Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. On page 7, the first sentence of the first full paragraph reads

"The systems according to the invention may in essence be produced by means of *suitable software* on a *computer* of a speech dialogue system or of a speech control of a device. For example, the speech recognition device, the comparator device, the correction device and the interrupt device may be fully produced as *software modules*. It is only necessary for the systems to include a possibility of speech output, for example, in addition to a loudspeaker with an amplifier an arrangement for generating speech based on *computer-readable data*. An example for this is a TTS converter (Text-To-Speech converter) which can also be produced by means of *suitable software*." (emphasis added)

The specification mentions suitable software on a computer and generating speech based on computer-readable data. It is implicit and well known in the art (i.e., it is general knowledge in the computer world) that suitable software and computer readable data are stored on a “computer readable storage medium.” Furthermore, “computer executable instructions” (as claimed), “suitable software”, “software modules” and “computer readable data” are all synonymous. Thus, while the specification does not explicitly spell out the words in the claim, the claim language is understood from the specification based on a general understanding of computer knowledge and use of synonymous words in the specification. If the Examiner would prefer that Applicants amend the specification in a particular way that would advance allowance of these remaining rejected claims, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned for further discussion to advance allowance. However, it is believed that Applicants have overcome the rejection of claims 14-15 and 18-20.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Yan Glickberg/

Yan Glickberg,
Reg. No. 51,742
Phone: 1.440.483.3455